IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANAAT CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: August 29, 2012

(1) CRR No. 186 of 2006

Pawan Kumar .... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

(2) CRR No. 206 of 2006

Gurpal Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

(3) CRR No. 235 of 2006

Parveen Kumar ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab .... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH

1) Whether Reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?.

2) To be referred to the Reporters or not ?.

3) Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr. R.K. Girdhar, Advocate,
for the petitioner (In CRR No. 186 of 2006)

Mr. Ashok Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner (In CRR No. 206 of 2006)

Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner (In CRR No. 235 of2006)

Mr. K.S. Aulakh, AAG, Punjab.

Paramjeet Singh, J.

By this common order, Criminal Revisions viz. CRR Nos. 186 of 2006, 206 of 2006 and 235 of 2006 are being decided together as the same arise from judgment dated 17.01.2006 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Faridkot.

All the aforesaid three appeals are directed against judgment dated 17.01.2006 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Faridkot, whereby appeals preferred by the petitioners have been dismissed by a common judgment with modification in sentence from one year to six months each in a case arising out of FIR No.3 dated 21.01.1995 under Section 420, 467, 468,471, 472, 473, 474, 109 IPC registered at Police Station City Kotkapura.

I need not dilate upon the facts of this case in detail as the same have already been recapitulated in the judgments of the learned Courts below and in view of the ultimate prayer of the petitioners seeking reduction in sentence.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

Learned counsel for the petitioners state that they are not pressing these revisions on merit and are not challenging the conviction on merit. They are only aggrieved against the sentence part. However, they pray that the sentence of the petitioners be suitably reduced as this criminal trial is hanging on their heads like Damocle's sword for almost seventeen years and it should be a sufficient mitigating circumstance to treat them

leniently. Counsel for the petitioners have further submitted that the occurrence pertains to the year 1995 and since then a period of almost seventeen years has elapsed. The petitioners have suffered the ordeal for long period.

In view of the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners, which have been noted above, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioners behind the bars at this point of time as the petitioners faced ordeal for 17 years. It is a fit case wherein sentence awarded to the petitioners can be reduced to the period already undergone and the petitioners can be burdened to pay compensation. Therefore, sentence is reduced to the period already undergone in these cases. However, the fine imposed upon the petitioners is enhanced to Rs.5000/- each. The impugned orders of sentence and conviction stand affirmed with aforesaid modification.

With the observations made above, all the three revision petitions are disposed of.

August 29, 2012 **[Paramjeet Singh]**
vkd **Judge**